IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.89 OF 2005

Atul Bhupal Jadhav ...Applicant
vs.
State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

Mr.Amit Sale for the Applicant
Ms M.M.Deshmukh,A.P.P. for State

CORAM: A.S.OKA,J.
DATE : OCTOBER 6,2005

P.C.:

1. Heard Advocates for the parties. On the last date the learned A.P.P. stated that the State has not preferred any Appeal against acquittal. The learned Advocate for the Applicant submitted that inspite of the clinching evidence led by the prosecution, the finding of acquittal is based only on the version of the defence Witness. He submitted that the findings recorded by the learned Sessions Judge are perverse.

2. I have considered the submissions. I have also gone through the notes of evidence. If paragraph Nos.50 to 52 of the impugned Judgment are perused, it is apparent that apart from the version of the defence Witness, the learned Sessions Judge has considered all the documentary and oral evidence on record. This is not a case where there is procedural illegality or manifest error of law in the order of the of the Court below. The view taken by the learned Sessions Judge appears to be a possible view. Hence, no interference is called for in a revisional jurisdiction. Revision Application is rejected.

JUDGE